

be sent to the President, who would reject them or send them on to the Congress in their entirety. They should then be considered on the “fast track”—an up or down vote, with no amendments, within 30 days of the submission by the President. Only in this way can the American people be assured that narrow interests do not pick apart the coherent and comprehensive recommendations of the bipartisan commission. (As you know, the recommendations of the base closing commission take effect unless they are rejected by the Congress, but in this instance I believe it is more appropriate to give the Congress the opportunity to vote up or down.)

Working together to follow up on our New Hampshire agreement, we have a rare opportunity for truly bipartisan cooperation on a matter of urgent concern to the American people. We have a chance to put aside partisan interests to work toward the national interest. I look forward to working with you toward this end, and to hearing your views on this proposal or others you might have for moving ahead, and I have directed my staff to meet with your staff on this matter. If we take these steps, we will set in motion a process that could truly transform American politics for the better.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

### **Remarks on the Unveiling of a Group of Seven Commemorative Plaque in Halifax**

*June 17, 1995*

Ladies and gentlemen, I just wanted to say a few words—I’m sure I speak on behalf of all of us here—to thank the people of Halifax and Nova Scotia and the leaders for making us feel so welcome, and to say a special word of appreciation for the leadership Prime Minister Chrétien has given to this conference. The people of Canada can be very, very proud of the direction and leadership that he gave this G-7 conference. It has been more businesslike, more informal, and more specific in its suggestions for what we can

do to improve the lives of our people than many of our previous meetings. And I think it is due to the leadership of the Prime Minister. And all of us wanted to express that to the people of Canada. We are very, very grateful for it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:05 a.m. at the Halifax Waterfront. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

### **The President’s Radio Address**

*June 17, 1995*

Good morning. I’m speaking to you from Halifax, Canada, where I’ve been meeting with the leaders of the world’s largest industrial democracies. We’ve taken concrete steps to strengthen the world economy. We’ve agreed on measures to anticipate and prevent future financial crises, like the one that happened earlier this year in Mexico, and to promote economic growth in countries that will provide markets of tomorrow for our American exports.

The work we’re doing here is part of my administration’s strategy to create jobs and raise incomes and living standards for the American people. Our responsibility is to restore the American dream, to give our children the chance that we’ve had to make America work well for all people who work hard.

To do that, one of the things we have to do is to reduce the deficit and balance the budget. Earlier this week, I outlined my plan to balance the budget in 10 years. This plan proves we can balance the budget while we continue to invest in the things that will keep America strong, things like education, health care, medical research, and technology. My plan will keep our economy strong as we eliminate the deficit. And unlike other plans, my plan protects the people in our country who have so much to give and who have given so much.

For example, my plan would avoid a number of cuts proposed by the Congress that would seriously hurt hundreds of thousands of American veterans. The House budget plan has proposed quadrupling the amount veterans pay for the prescription drugs they

need, while cutting taxes a lot for upper income Americans who don't really need a tax cut.

Under my plan that wouldn't happen. We can balance the budget in 10 years without harming the people who protected our Nation and who now have to get by without much to live on.

The Senate budget plan has similar flaws. For example, it proposes to deny veterans benefits to anyone in the military who is injured unless that injury is directly connected to the performance of his or her duties. Now, think about what that means. A young Army sergeant stationed overseas is on his way home from the movie theater one night when he's off duty. He gets hit by a drunk driver, and he's paralyzed. The Senate budget says, "Tough luck, no veterans benefits to help you with the injury."

I think we've got a duty to help our veterans when they're sick or injured. But we also have a duty to balance the budget. What I want you to know is that we can do both. My plan cuts Federal spending by \$1.1 trillion. It does not raise taxes. It is disciplined, comprehensive, and serious. It won't be easy, but we need to do it, and we can.

Let's keep in mind the purpose. The purpose is to renew the American dream, to grow the middle class in terms of jobs and incomes, and to give poor people the chance to work themselves into the middle class.

With that purpose in mind, my balanced budget has five basic priorities: First, help people make the most of their own lives. That means that while we cut the deficit, we have to increase investment in education, not cut education.

Second, we have to control health care costs, but do it by strengthening Medicare, saving Medicaid, not by slashing services for the elderly. We can maintain benefits by cutting costs through genuine reform, like more home care for the elderly so they can stay out of more expensive institutions, preventive mammograms, and respite care for people with Alzheimer's, and cracking down on fraud and abuse and giving people more incentives to go into managed care.

Third, cut taxes, but do it for the middle class, not the wealthy. We shouldn't cut education or Medicare just to give people money

who don't really need it. Instead, let's help middle class Americans pay for college, like the GI bill did for veterans after World War II.

Fourth, save money by cutting welfare, but do it in a way that saves enough for investment to move people to work. Don't save money just by throwing people off the rolls or hurting their children, who are vulnerable through no fault of their own. The congressional proposals are tough on kids and weak on work. We need to be tough on work and supportive of children. The congressional approach will cost a lot more money down the road than it will ever save.

The fifth principle is, as I've said before, balance the budget in 10 years. We could do it in 7 years, as some in Congress want. But there's no reason to inflict the pain that would cause or to run the risk of a recession. Think about it like this: If you bought a home with a mortgage, you'd sure want to pay it off just as fast as you could without hurting your family. But if the choice was pay it off in 10 years and pay your medical bills and send your daughter to college, or pay it off in 7 and go without the best care and tell your daughter you're sorry but she'll have to fend for herself, I don't think you'd have a hard time making the right choice. We can have all the benefits of balancing the budget without a lot of the burdens if we'll do it in 10 instead of 7 years.

Now, don't let anybody fool you: balancing the budget is not going to be a walk in the park. It will require real cuts; it will cause real pain. But the difference between my plan and the congressional plans is the difference between necessary cuts and unacceptable pain. Remember the goals: Restore the American dream, promote jobs and higher incomes, reinforce families and communities.

This is a time when we must, more than ever before, join together to seize the opportunities before us, a moment of immense promise. We can renew the American dream, and we have to do it and do it right.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at approximately 5:30 p.m. on June 16 at the Chateau Halifax for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 17.

**Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Halifax**

*June 17, 1995*

**Q.** Mr. President, let me ask you a question. Are you now changing your mind as to the people against whom Mr. Yeltsin is waging a war when you learn what's going on in Budennovsk? That's Russian Television News question.

**President Yeltsin.** In the first place, I would like to say that my friend, Bill, has never wavered in his opinion. He has always supported and is supporting Russia and President Yeltsin.

I would like to say that the storming of the hospital is continuing, that we have liberated 200 hostages, and the operation is going on. I am in contact, in constant contact with our commanders who command our special forces who stormed the hospital, and I am in full control of the situation.

Taking this example, you should judge for yourselves that Chechnya today is the center of world terrorism, of bribery and corruption and mafia. We couldn't act otherwise. We had to destroy those terrorists and bandits.

Well, not all in the world understood this situation correctly and perhaps not all of the mass media understood correctly. But I am very glad that my friend, Bill, understood me correctly and, nonetheless, always defended his position no matter what happened.

I just have to say that our state Dumas, as a matter of fact, today has made the decision to have the President go back, come back home and make a visit to Budennovsk. I think, therefore, that this is a bad mistake, a bad move on their part because now I, myself, become a hostage to these very same bandits by having to go back there.

And moreover, I have to say that after my discussion yesterday—and I once again reiterated that today to our partners in the G-7 and told them what kind of people we're dealing with, what kind of horrible criminals with black bands on their foreheads—they now much better understand that this is really the only way that we can deal with these criminal elements. They really now understand much more.

Dear journalists, Bill and I accumulated a whole host of very important issues—global issues, not some internal Russian disputes and issues or internal American problems. These are really serious, overwhelming global issues. And therefore, I say, we've got to go.

Thank you, and goodbye.

**Q.** President Clinton, do you agree with what he said about your position?

**President Clinton.** Well, let me tell you what my position is. First of all, it is true that the United States has always said that Chechnya was a part of Russia and was ultimately a problem that had to be resolved by the people of your nation, consistent with your constitutional laws.

It is also true that we believe that terrorism everywhere is wrong, that terrorism in the Middle East is wrong, that people blowing up our Federal building in Oklahoma City is wrong, and people taking over a hospital in your country and killing innocent civilians is wrong, and has to be resisted strong.

But I also subscribe to the position taken by the G-7 that sooner or later—better sooner than later—the cycle of violence has to be broken. And ultimately, in any democracy, there has to be a political solution to people's differences. And so that is what we have urged.

President Yeltsin and I have had several conversations about this. When I was in Moscow I said that I understood it was a terribly difficult situation for Russia but that the United States believed that, ultimately, in any democracy, all decisions were finally resolved in a political manner in a way that would permit the cycle of violence to be broken.

So that is our position. It is still our position. And we hope that it will become more possible now. But nothing—nothing—can justify this outrageous act at your hospital and innocent people being killed. It's just wrong.

I want to mention one other issue because it won't be in the headlines, but it's terribly important. When President Yeltsin and I were together in Moscow for the anniversary of the end of World War II, we talked about the problem of nuclear security. And I told him then I thought it was very important that we work closely together on the problem of